Dear Paul,

8/11/75

Saturday the post office is renumbering the rural routes, for the third time since we've been here. Beginning then we are Rt. 12. We began as 7.

I am familiar with and full of respect for Lear's work. Not only Archie. I don't look at the tube that much but sometimes we eat to those fine shows.

Finally Playboy answered, with a very nice, apologetic letter saying the xerox had begome lodged in some unrecognized track of the alimentary canal of the corporation and that they'd be glad to pay for the cost of a secretary to past the corrections and then for the xeroxing.

This may be nice but it isn't practical. I can't fool around with the master from which I'll print and it is from that alone that I can xerox. Corrections can fall off and I've have no way of knowing it had happened. (After six months it also isn't a bit too soon, either.)

Capying the unedited copy in England also isn't practical. The cost also is too great. I just heard from the correspondent who has it two days ago. He still wants to do the condensation in which we believe the commercial prospects lie.

There is a new offset process for which maybe ten plants in the country are equipped. Some aspects are exceptionally competitive. The plant is costly, so each operator has special deals on special papers, exclusively. One has a not inexpensive thin paper with a high opacity factor. The meaning for me, if I can swing the money, is that I can have a heavier documentary appendix, without running over the bindery capacity or the limit for a 2-lb mailing, which would run the costs of each copy up. I do not have the estimates on that yet but on a heavier paper I feel I can swing a 660-page book, meaning more than 150 pages of documents. I'll have to borrow maybe $2,500 to pay this printer and I'll run what risks are involved on the borrowing. If the thinner paper and the possibilities of a larger appendix run more I'll have to think that through when I get the numbers.

I see nothing unreasonable in the people with whom you are talking wanting to see what they can see. I do feel that if they are unwilling to take the time to read the earlier works they lack as deep and sincere an interest as I would like them to regard as more substantial than the commercial ones. Not that there is any conflict. I think both coincide. It just is beyond me. On the other hand, I can't imagine it being a real cost, if any, for them to have me fly out there and bring what they'd like to see and answer any questions they might have. They probably belong to organizations that have speakers, too. Anybody in production could have written 100% off as a legit business expense. And if none has been east there are those who have read the book to whom I can refer them, from correspondents to lawyers specializing in publishing.

In printing myself I am risking much but I see no real choice (for me, anyway). We have put every penny that comes in from the earlier books into an escrow account. We've taken from that only for extreme emergencies and for the distribution costs of WW IV. My reason for the escrow account was to be able to reprint the earlier works as those editions become exhausted. So, I'll run that risk, too. What this means we'll be trying to live on you'd not believe possible. Welfare is luxury in comparison.

In order to prepare the book I'm getting up 4 a.m. again. There are never any interruptions then until others can use the phone. I'm editing what I dashed off earlier for a new close/addition with new evidence still.

While I'd prefer almost any other way of bringing this out I see no real alternative. The two advantages it has is that nobody will be requiring any compromises of me and I'll own the work 100%. (How Hollywood people can't see the risk justification when there are other nets and CBS has announced a November special baffles me..

What I can t avoid keeps me from laying out a fixed schedule. Each day brings some of this. However, I hope to have printed copies in a couple of months.

At that point the value of a condensation/popularization may be apparent.

But right now I can't even afford help so I have everything to do myself. Remember that I am also involved in litigation, and that takes time. And as a publisher have books to send out daily.

So, I'm slowed down some and as much as I can I'm adjusted to it.

One of the compromises this requires is that now I can't do more about Mac.

I did have a commission. I've met it (and paid my taxes for the year with it).

However, I went farthur, much farthur, than I was paid to go. This was my own interest and curiosity.

I did not know it was his secretary but I did know there was a younger woman. I wonder-d if this explained his lust for money when he can live comfortably.

Correction on "he worked with Army intelligence." He was in it, at least at Ft. Holabird. He then met a man who may have been the actual inventor of the Identikit. This man developed it on government time. There is an inference that it was ripped off. The fingerprint method seems to be the inkless one.

I don't see JBS stuff unless people send it. My hunch, not knowledge, is that Church was at one of the Bilderberg meetings. That would be enough for the JBS interpretation. They seem to have a thing on "Bilderbergers."

I have to get back to work. I'll read the Freep piece, Turners for PNS, when I rest. I'm aware of that crap. Even Garrison couldn't do anything with it. But I am glad to get the clips, which I do read and I can leave as a record. That is the newest opkin kick. It also involves another fraud, one Luis Castillo, from what I've learned from what reporters have been asking me. All nonsense.

The last I heard of Mac he was to deal with Zebra/Zacharias (Bay area, and I know little of them) in a National Star package.

If it is not too much trouble, please watch the LATimes for me. They have undergoing some policy/attitude changes. I can't see it but I know the (RFK)basis.

Your rare kindness, by the way, has enabled me to be more efficient. Again thanks for it.

Best regards,